

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action of December 12, 2007, in which the Examiner (1) rejected claims 1-16, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. PG PUB 2004/0243968 ("**Hecksel**"). (2) rejected claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hecksel** in view of U.S. PG PUB 2005/0015675 ("**Kolawa**"), and (3) rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hecksel** in view of U.S. PG PUB 2003/0058280 ("**Molinari**").

By the present Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 22 have been amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner to the undersigned during a telephone interview on January 31, 2008. During that interview, Applicants' representative explained his views of the present invention and the relevance of **Hecksel**.

Among other things, Applicants' representative explained the **Hecksel** is directed to a system and method for "evaluating and selecting methodologies for a software development process" (see Abstract), whereas Applicants' invention is used in a development project where a development methodology has already been selected for the project. Further, **Hecksel** does not have *both* a displayed graph illustrating the total work and total resources for *development*, and a displayed graph illustrating the total work and total resources for *testing* (as recited, e.g., in claim 1.

As understood, the Examiner believes that the term "planning," which had previously been recited in the claims, is more appropriate for a process used in selecting a development methodology (such as disclosed in **Hecksel**), rather than for a project where the development methodology has already been selected or determined (such as in Applicants' invention).

Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 4, 5, and 22 to replace the term "planning" with the term "managing," and to also recite that the development methodology or process has been "selected." Such amendments are believed to clearly distinguish the claimed subject matter from **Hecksel**. Dependent claim 7 has been amended for consistency with claim 5.

For the forgoing reasons, Applicants believe all claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the cited references (**Hecksel, Kolawa and Molinari**).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen F. Jewett/

Stephen F. Jewett
Reg. No. 27,565

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFJ:ss
61276102 v1